THE W LAW FIRM P.L.L.C.

David T. Wilkison, Esq. P.O. Box 75 Vail, Arizona 85641 (520) 647-0531 david@thewlawfirm.com

CLERK OF SUPERFOR COURT

By Deputy

APR - 1 2019

FILED
In Open Court
by\_\_\_\_TIME

Attorney for Defendant

State Bar No. 029548

# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF COCHISE

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL TURNER,

Defendant.

Plaintiff,

The Honorable James L. Conlogue
Division V

COMES NOW, the Defendant, MICHAEL TURNER, by and through counsel undersigned, pursuant to the United States Constitution, the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Arizona Constitution, Article 2 '8, hereby respectfully requests this court to suppress any and all evidence seized from the house the Defendant's residence1 for the following reasons that such evidence was obtained without a warrant or the presence of exigent circumstances.

### I. FACTS

On December 5, 2018, Officers Olmstead, and Larimer conducted a traffic stop for a civil violation. It was found that during the stop, the occupants of the vehicle had purchased Methamphetamine from Sherill Rogers at her address, 217 N. First Street, Sierra Vista, AZ. 85635. A search warrant was drafted based on the information from the traffic stop. The search

1 217 N. First Street, APT B, Sierra Vista, AZ. 85635.

warrant was specifically for: 1: the person of Sherill Rogers; 2: the premises as described as 217 N. First Street, Sierra Vista, AZ. 85635 and 3: A hot pink Dodge Neon vehicle registered to Sherrill Rogers.

Mr. Turner resides in a small house in the back area of Sherrill Roger's residence. Mr. Turner's address is: 217 N. 1<sup>st</sup> St. Apt B, Sierra Vista, AZ. 85635. See Exhibit A: Mr. Turner's identification card and Voter ID card.

The search warrant affidavit (Exhibit B: Search Warrant Affidavit dated December 5, 2018) did not mention the search of the apartment that was leased to Mr. Turner. The search warrant affidavit described the residence of Sherrill Rogers as follows:

•217 N. 1st St, Sierra Vista, AZ, 85635. 217 N. 1st St is a mobile home constructed of wood siding. The residence is gray in color with tan trim surrounding the roof and windows. The residence is situated in a fashion where the front door faces the North and the West side of the residence faces 1st St. The front is raised off of the ground and the entry way is covered by white lattice siding. The door is located on the North West side of the residence. Black in color numbers showing "217" are situated on the west side of the residence and are clearly visible from the street. The Northwest corner of the property is surrounded by a chain-link which continues around to the back side (East) of the residence. Further, a white in color shed can be observed from the street, sitting in the back yard of the residence.

See Ex. B. p. 1.

Mr. Turner's residence is not described in the affidavit for the Search Warrant, or in the Search Warrant that was granted by Judge Dickerson. See Exhibit C: Search Warrant signed by Judge Dickerson dated December 5, 2018. Mr. Turner rented out a house located in the back of

Sherrill Rogers residence. Mr. Turner's residence *cannot* be seen from the street and is *not* a "shed." Interesting to note, there is a shed in the backyard of Ms. Roger's residence that is noticeable from the street that was searched the day the search warrant was executed. Again, this is *not* Mr. Turner's residence.

None-the-less, Mr. Turner's residence was searched by law enforcement when the Search Warrant was executed for Ms. Roger's residence. As a result, a small amount of Marijuana for personal use as well as drug paraphernalia was obtained from Mr. Turner's residence.

## II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

## (1) State has the burden of proof

Rule 16.2 (b) of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure states "[t]he prosecutor shall have the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, the lawfulness in all respects of the acquisition of all evidence which the prosecutor will use at trial." "To establish he presumptive invalidity of a search is to establish a prima facie case for suppression; an unrebutted presumption carries the day." Rodrigues v. Arellano, 979 P.2d 539, 542 (Ariz. App. Div. I. 1999).

# (2) The Fourth Amendment

The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Art. II '8 of the Arizona Constitution proscribe unreasonable intrusions by the state into the private domains of individuals. The Fourth Amendment was specifically designed to prevent the unlawful entry into a suspect's home or dwelling. Welsh v. Wisconsin, 466 U.S. 740, 748 (1984). In the context of governmental invasions into the home, the Arizona Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that the Arizona Constitution offers even greater protection than the Fourth Amendment. State v. Ault, 150 Ariz. 459, 466 (1986) (en banc); State v. Bolt, 142 Ariz. 260, 265 (1984). In Bolt, the Arizona Supreme Court held that gaining evidence from a defendant's home while police officers "secured" the home to

await a warrant, violated the Arizona Constitution. <u>Id</u>. In <u>State v. Ault, supra</u>, it declined to apply the inevitable discovery doctrine to a pair of shoes found in plain view while officers illegally intruded into a suspect's home. <u>Id</u>. at 466. The <u>Ault</u> decision articulated the standard that the Arizona Constitution sets with regard to governmental intrusions into the home "unlawful entry into homes and seizure of evidence cannot be tolerated." <u>Id</u>.

Further, warrantless searches and seizures are <u>per se</u> unreasonable, subject to carefully drawn exceptions to the warrant requirement. <u>Coolidge v. New Hampshire</u>, 403 U.S. 443 (1970). Moreover, it is "a basic principle of Fourth Amendment Law" that search and seizures inside a dwelling without a warrant are <u>presumptively</u> unreasonable. <u>Payton v. New York</u> 445 U.S. 573 (1980). See also <u>Glazer v. City of Long Beach</u> 210 F.Supp.2d 1131 (Cal. 2000) (Explicating the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuits approach to <u>Payton</u>).

Evidence obtained pursuant to a search and seizure in violation of the Fourth Amendment shall be suppressed under the judicially developed exclusionary rule. Illinois v. Krull, 480 U.S. 340, 347 (1987). Further derivative or secondary evidence "tainted" by the constitutional violation must be suppressed. Wong Sun v. United States, 471 U.S. 471 (1963). The exclusionary rule extends as well to the indirect as to the direct products (derivative products) of unconstitutional conduct. Segura v. United States, 468 U.S. 796, 804 (1984). The Defendant asserts that the search of his apartment in the back of Ms. Roger's residence, without a warrant or valid consent, does not fall within any of the recognized exceptions to the warrant requirement.

A defendant must have a reasonable expectation of privacy in the place searched to assert the violation of his Fourth Amendment rights as grounds for challenging the admission of evidence. Rakas v. Illinois, 439 U.S. 128 (1978). An overnight guest has a legitimate expectation of privacy. Minnesota v. Olson, 495 U.S. 91 (2000). As such, the Defendant asserts that he, as the registered guest paying for the house located at 217 N. 1st St. Apt #B, Sierra Vista,

27

26

28

AZ 85635., had the proper standing to trigger the exclusionary rule. Any evidence resulting directly or indirectly from this illegal search, must be suppressed as fruits of the poisonous tree.

# (3) No exigent circumstances were present

Officers entered Mr. Turner's residence without a warrant and in the absence of exigent circumstances. "Warrantless searches [of residences and hotel rooms] are per se unreasonable under the fourth amendment, except in a few carefully delineated instances." United States v. Radka, 904 F.2d 357, 360-361 (6th Cir.1990). The exigent circumstances exception relies on the premise that the existence of an emergency situation, demanding urgent police action, may excuse the failure to procure a search warrant. Id. Under exigent circumstances, a warrantless entry may be required to secure evidence that is in the process of being lost or destroyed. Such warrantless entries and searches are "presumptively unreasonable." Id. Therefore, the State bears the "heavy burden" of demonstrating exigency. See id.

The possible destruction of evidence or a risk of danger to police or others are two situations that can satisfy the exigent circumstances exception. United States v. Johnson, 22 F.3d 674, 680 (6th Cir. 1994). However, "a warrantless search must be strictly circumscribed by the exigencies which justify its initiation." Mincey v. Arizona, 437 U.S. 385, 393, 98 S.Ct. 2408, 57 L.Ed.2d 290 (1978). See also, Johnson, 22 F.3d at 680; United States v. Socey, 846 F.2d 1439. 1445 (D.C.Cir.1988) (stating "Once police officers have the requisite belief that destruction of evidence is imminent, their entry must be limited in scope to the minimum intrusion necessary to prevent the destruction of evidence"); United States v. Halliman, 923 F.2d 873, 880 (D.C.Cir.1991) (same).

# (a) No one posed a threat to destroy or remove evidence

Here, there was never any possibility that anyone would destroy any evidence in Mr. Turner's residence; this is further strengthened that law enforcement did not even know that Mr. Turner's residence even existed when doing their "investigation." Thus, there was no justification for the officers' warrantless entry to Mr. Turner's residence. The instant officers were investigating Sherrill Roger's sale of methamphetamine. Mr. Turner's name or residence was never mentioned throughout the "investigation."

# (b) No one posed a threat to officer safety

There is no indication in any of the reports for the "investigation" that there was any threat to officer safety, quite the opposite actually. When the search warrant was conducted, all parties cooperated in the search. Yet, instead of simply securing and sealing Mr. Turner's residence, the officers proceeded to conduct a warrantless search of the residence.

#### IV. **CONCLUSION**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

WHEREFORE, the Defendant respectfully requests this Court to suppress all the evidence seized from the residence of 217 N. 1st St, Apt B, Sierra Vista, AZ. 85635 as no exigencies were present and there was no threat to officer safety.

In addition to the suppression of the unlawfully seized evidence, Mr. Turner respectfully requests that his case be dismissed with prejudice as it is in the interest of justice.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of April, 2019.

THE W LAW FIRM P.L.L.C.

David T. Wilkison, Esa. Attorney for Defendant

A Copy of the foregoing Sent/Emailed on April 1st, 2019 to the following:

Hon. James L. Conlogue Cochise County Superior Court 100 Quality Hill Rd. Bisbee, Arizona 85603

Ruth Faulkner, Deputy County Attorney 150 Quality Hill Rd.

Bisbee, Arizona 85603

By:

David T. Wilkison, Esq.

27

28



# **EXHIBIT A**

# COCHSE COUNT ARIZONA DAVID W. TEVENS, C. LATY RECORDER

99 03 1 02

ID NUMBE R 0200073063

YTY -

DATE F-1 4/9/2007

DOS: 1988

STAN 1ST ST UNIT B STAN 1STA, AZ 856 15-1529

Congress Socirict 2 Legislative District

4.1

V ARD SCHOOL

**6**3

ILILIZOULUL IDENTIFICATION

NOT FOR FEDERAL IDENTIFICATION

40 IDN D0338 15 3 DOB 03/24: 332



1 TURNER

2 MICHAEL ALLEN

8 217 N 1ST ST # 5 SIERRA VISTA, AZ 85635-1529

4b EXP

4a ISS 02/01/2018

15 SEX M

18 EYES HAZ

16 HGT 6'-04" 19 HAIR BRO

17 WGT 185 lb

03/21/88

5 DD 6047C3474T1440M8



# **EXHIBIT C**

# IN JUSTICE COURT, PRECINCT NO 5. IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF COCHISE

## SEARCH WARRANT

COPY

No.5w26180216

TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Proof by affidavit having been made before me on this date, 5th Day of December 2018 by Detective R. Olmstead #1419, I am satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that:

(X) on the person of:

Sherril Rogers, White Female, 5'07", 140lbs, blue eyes, brown hair

DOB: 10-25-59

SSN: 526-35-0867

(X) in and upon the premises known and described as:

217 N. 1<sup>st</sup> St, Slerra Vista, AZ, 85635. 217 N. 1<sup>st</sup> St Is a mobile home constructed of wood siding. The residence is gray in color with tan trim surrounding the roof and windows. The residence is situated in a fashion where the front door faces the North and the West side of the residence faces 1<sup>st</sup> St. The front is raised off of the ground and the entry way is covered by white lattice siding. The door is located on the North West side of the residence. Black in color numbers showing "217" are situated on the west side of the residence and are clearly visible from the street. The Northwest comer of the property is surrounded by a chain-link which continues around to the back side (East) of the residence. Further, a white in color shed can be observed from the street, sitting in the back yard of the residence.

SHERIFF'S OFFICE OFFICIAL COPY (X) in vehicle(s) described as:

A hot pink in color, 4 door Dodge Neon bearing an AZ license plate of CAL4298

Registered to:Sherril Rogers, White Female, 5'07", 140lbs, blue eyes, brown hair, DOB10-25-59

VIN: 183E556C63D254776

there is certain person (s), property or things

- {x} Which were used as means for committing a public offense
- {x} Which are being possessed with intent to use as a means of committing a public offense
- (x) which consists of any item or constitutes any evidence which tends to show that a public offense has been committed such as being more fully described in the affidavit.

THAT SAID PROPERTY OR THINGS ARE DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

"See Attachment A"

YOU ARE THEREFORE COMMANDED (In the day time) to make a search of the herein described person(s), premises or things and if you find such or any part thereof, to retain such in your custody in accordance with A.R.S. 13-3920.

YOU ARE THEREFORE COMMANDED to make due return of this writ within Five (5) days of the date thereof as directed by law in accordance with A.R.S. 13-3918.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND or direction and dated this 5th Day of December, 2018

CHERTES OFFICE

OFFICIAL COPY

7

## Attachment A

- Books, records, receipts, notes, ledgers, other papers, computers, computer disks, magnetic media or other means of electronically storing information relating to possession or sale of Methamphetamine and possession of drug paraphemalia.
- Address and/or telephone books and papers reflecting names, addresses, and or telephone numbers of any persons who may be involved in the illegal possession and sale of Methamphetamine and possession of drug paraphemalia.
- 3. Books, records, receipts, bank statements and records, money drafts, letters of credit, money order and cashiers check receipts, passbooks, bank checks and other items evidencing the obtaining, secreting, transfer, and or concealment of assets and the obtaining, secreting, transfer, and or concealment of assets and the obtaining, secreting, transfer, concealment and or expenditure of money, safe deposit box records and or keys.
- United States currency, precious metals, jewelry, and financial instruments, including, but not limited to, stocks and bonds and real estate deeds of trust.
- Photographs, in particular, photographs of co-conspirators of assets and or of:
   Possession/ Sale of Methamphetamine and possession of drug paraphernalia.
- 6. A usable amount of: Illicit drugs



- Paraphernalia for packaging, cutting, weighing, distributing and using
   Methamphetamine including but not limited to, scales, plastic envelopes, Pipes, Etc.
- 8. Indicia of occupancy, residency, and or ownership of the premises described above, including but not limited to, utility and telephone bills, canceled envelopes and keys.
- 9. All other material evidence of violations of ARS title 13 chapter 34.
- 10. Rent receipts, phone bills, utility bills or other indicia of ownership, dominion or control of the above described premises and or vehicles.
- 11. Telephone (s) and telephone messaging records, including subscriber and call records, statements, stored volcemail, stored telephone numbers, and or machine messages.

